arXiv:1512.04174v2 [math.AG] 4 Jan 2016

Towards characterization of all 3×3 extremal quasiconvex quadratic forms

Davit Harutyunyan and Graeme Walter Milton
Department of Mathematics, The University of Utah

January 6, 2016

Abstract

Given a $d \times d$ quasiconvex quadratic form, $d \geq 3$, we prove that if the determinant of its acoustic tensor is an irreducible extremal polynomial that is not identically zero, then the form itself is an extremal quasiconvex quadratic form, i.e. it loses its quasiconvexity whenever a convex quadratic form is subtracted from it. In the special case $d = 3$, we slightly weaken the condition, namely we prove, that if the determinant of the acoustic tensor of the quadratic form is an extremal polynomial that is not a perfect square, then the form itself is an extremal quadratic form. In the case $d = 3$ we also prove, that if the determinant of the acoustic tensor of the form is identically zero, then the form is either an extremal or polyconvex. Also, if the determinant of the acoustic tensor of the form is a perfect square, then the form is either extremal, polycovex, or is a sum of a rank-one form and an extremal, whose acoustic tensor determinant is identically zero. Here we use the notion of extremality introduced by Milton in [17].

Keywords: Extremal quasiconvex functions, polyconvexity, rank-one convexity

1 Introduction

Convexity is intimately tied with theromodynamic stability: if the free energy of a material is not a convex function of the state variables, then when the material has state variables in the non-convex portion, it will naturally phase separate into two phases, each at the end of a tie line bridging the non-convex portion, thus reducing the energy to a linear average of the energies of the two constituent phases (see [6] and the introduction by Arthur Wightman in the book [12]). For elasticity, among other examples, the picture is more complicated as when the material phase separates the displacement field (ignoring the possiblity of cracking) must be continuous across the phase boundaries. Such phase separation is most easily seen in shape memory materials such as Nitinol. The simplest of all geometries for the phase separated material is a laminate of the two phases (also known as a twinned structure when the two phases are reflections of each other) and the continuity of the displacement field forces the difference of the displacement gradient in one phase minus the displacement field

in the second phase to be a rank-one tensor. Thus to avoid this layering transformation the energy f as a function of the displacement gradient must be a rank one convex function i.e.

$$\theta f(A) + (1-\theta) f(B) \geq f(\theta A + (1-\theta)B) \tag{1.1}$$

for all $\theta \in (0,1)$ and for all matrices A and B such that $A - B = x \otimes y$ for some vectors x and y. More generally to avoid separation at the microscale into other geometries of possibly lower energy (with affine boundary conditions on the displacement u at the boundary $\partial\Omega$ of the body, i.e. $u(x) = Fx$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$ for some fixed matrix F), the energy $f(\nabla u(x))$ has to be a quasiconvex function of $\nabla u(x)$. For more details about this theory of the stability of energy functions for non-linear elasticity the reader is referred to [2].

The theory of quasiconvexity dates back even further to the pioneering work of Morrey [20, 21] and has become central in the calculus of variations, material science, continuum mechanics, topology optimization, and in the theory of composites. We refer to the book of Dacorogna [7] and the references therein for developments of the theory of quasiconvex analysis. In general it is very difficult to determine if a non-quadratic function is quasiconvex, so Ball [2] introduced the notion of polyconvexity, which is an intermediate condition between convexity and quasiconvexity: a function is polyconvex if it is a convex function of $\nabla u(x)$, its determinant, and other minors, these latter being the null-Lagrangians or quasi-affine functions, whose average only depends on F. If $f(\xi)$ is quadratic then $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex if and only if it can be written as a sum of a convex function and a null-Lagrangian, which in the quadratic case is a linear combination of 2×2 minors of the matrix $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$, [7, page 192, Lemma 5.27]. There exist quadratic forms that are quasiconvex but not polyconvex, as shown by Terpstra in [26], which in the algebraic geometry language means, there exist nonnegative biquadratic forms that are not sums of squares, [23]. Explicit examples were given by Serre [27,28], and later in [8] we obtained an especially simple example:

$$f(\xi) = \xi_{11}^2 + \xi_{22}^2 + \xi_{33}^2 + \xi_{12}^2 + \xi_{23}^2 + \xi_{31}^2 - 2(\xi_{11}\xi_{22} + \xi_{22}\xi_{33} + \xi_{33}\xi_{11}). \tag{1.2}$$

For linear elasticity a necessary condition for a body containing a linearly elastic homogeneous material with elasticity tensor C to be stable when the displacement is fixed at the boundary is the Legendre-Hadamard condition, which is equivalent to rank one convexity for C^2 functions [7], that is, the quadratic form associated with C, $f(\xi) = (C\xi;\xi)$ be rank-one convex, i.e.,

$$f(x \otimes y) = \sum_{ijk\ell=1}^{3} x_i y_j C_{ijk\ell} x_k y_\ell \geq 0 \quad \forall x, y,$$

which is an algebraic condition. If one has equality for some non-zero x, y then shear bands can form. For general quadratic forms $f(\xi) = (M\xi;\xi)$, Van Hove [29,30] proved that rank-one convexity is equivalent to quasiconvexity. Due to this, and since we are only dealing with quadratic functions, we will use the terms quasiconvexity and rank-one convexity interchangeably. Here we are interested in quadratic rank-one convex functions that are extremal in the sense of Milton ([17, page 87, see also 18, section 25.2]:

Definition 1.1. *A quadratic quasiconvex form is called an extremal if one cannot subtract a rank-one form from it while preserving the quasiconvexity of the form.*

In the algebraic language, extremality reads as follows: *A nonnegative biquadratic form* $f(x \otimes y) = \sum_{ijk\ell=1}^{3} x_i y_j C_{ijk\ell} x_k y_\ell$ *is extremal, if it can not be written as a perfect square plus a nonnegative form.* In the case of degree four nonnegative homogeneous polynomials that depend in 3 variables, a related problem was considered and solved by Hilbert, [10], where he shows, that such polynomials are necessarily sums of perfect squares, thus there is no extremals among them. In the case of nonnegative homogeneous polynomials of even degree that depend on $n > 2$ variables, Hilbert proved, that they are not necessarily sums of squares of polynomials, but sums of squares of rational functions. The problem of sums of squares is well-known in algebraic and a recent significant result was obtained in [5]. Milton presented an algorithm of finding such extremal forms in [19], proving, that any quasiconvex quadratic form is a sum of an extremal and a polyconvex forms. Milton also proved new sharp inequalities by using extremal forms in [19]. The first non-trivial explicit example of an extremal quasiconvex function is that given in [8] and is the function (1.2) (which is also extremal in the two stronger senses of extremality introduced in that paper). Subsequently, in [9] we found a surprising and unexpected link between extremal quasiconvex functions with orthotropic symmetry and extremal polynomials (namely those polynomials that take only non-negative values, and which lose this property when any other non-negative polynomial is subtracted from them). It is clear that for the quadratic form $f(\xi) = (M\xi; \xi)$, with $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{N\times n}$, the expression for $f(x\otimes y)$ can be written as $xC(y)x^T$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $C(y)$ is an $N \times N$ symmetric matrix with its entries being quadratic forms in y. The matrix $C(y)$ is called the acoustic tensor of f or just the $y-$matrix of $f(x\otimes y)$. The authors proved in [9], that an elasticity quasiconvex tensor (a quasiconvex quadratic form $f(\xi)$ that depends solely on the symmetric part of ξ) with orthotropic symmetry is extremal if the determinant of the $y-$matrix (acoustic tensor) is an extremal polynomial that is not a perfect square, see [9, Theorem 5.1].

The goal of this work is to characterize all 3×3 extremals, while our final goal is to characterize all $m\times n$ extremals. We distinguish four main cases that exhaust all possibilities:

(i) The determinant of the acoustic matrix of $f(x \otimes y)$ is an extremal polynomial that is not a perfect square.

(ii) The determinant of the acoustic matrix of $f(x \otimes y)$ is equivalently zero.

(iii) The determinant of the acoustic matrix of $f(x \otimes y)$ is an extremal polynomial that is a perfect square.

(iv) The determinant of the acoustic matrix of $f(x \otimes y)$ is not an extremal polynomial.

In this paper we extend the result proven in [9] to any 3×3 quadratic form. These of course include forms that need not be orthotropic and which can depend not just on the symmetric part of ξ, i.e., the strain in the elasticity context, but also on its antisymmetric part. In this paper we study cases (i), (ii) and (iii) completely and conjecture on the case (iv). We believe, that case (iv) provides no extremals. Some of the ideas of the proof already appeared in our work in [9]. As we aim to keep the present paper proof-self-contained, we shall repeat some of the ideas and proofs from [9]. It is rather striking, that our proof is a mixture of analytic and algebraic tools. The problem under consideration is of algebraic

geometry nature but comes from applications in composite materials and metamaterials and at first sight looks to be a part of quasiconvex analysis. Some motivations for studying extremals were discussed in section 2 of [9]. Briefly, in the theory of composites one powerful method for obtaining bounds on effective tensor has proven to be the translation method introduced by Tartar and Murat [24,22,25] and Lurie and Cherkaev [14, 15]. These bounds are tightest if one uses extremal quasiconvex forms as shown in [17, page 87], see also [18, section 25.2]. Allaire and Kohn [1] used certain type of extremals to bound the elastic energy of two phase composites with isotropic phases. Kang and Milton [13] extended the translation method as a tool for bounding the volume fractions of materials in a two-phase body from boundary measurements and in this context too it is natural to use extremal quasiconvex forms (although it is an open question as to whether it is always best to use extremal quasiconvex forms in this context). Extremal quasiconvex forms are also the best choice of quasiconvex functions for obtaining series expansions for effective tensors that have an extended domain of convergence, and thus analyticity properties as a function of the component moduli on this domain [see section 14.8, and page 373 of section 18.2 of 18].

2 Extremal polynomials and determinants of quasiconvex quadratic forms: The main results

In this section we recall the notions of *extremality and equivalence* of homogeneous polynomials, e.g., [23] and formulate our main results. We start with a brief introduction.

Definition 2.1. *Assume m and n are natural numbers and $P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ is a polynomial of degree $2m$ that is homogeneous of the same degree. Then $P(x)$ is called an extremal polynomial, if $P(x) \geq 0$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $P(x)$ cannot be written as a sum of two other non-negative polynomials that are linearly independent.*

Definition 2.2. *Assume m and n are natural numbers and $P(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ and $Q(x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n)$ are polynomials of degree $2m$ that are homogeneous of the same degree. Then $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$ are equivalent if there exists a non-singular matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n\times n}$ such that $P(x) = Q(Ax)$.*

It is then straightforward to prove that this notion of equivalence is actually an equivalence relation preserving also the extremality of polynomials.

Theorem 2.3. *The notion of equivalence introduced in Definition 2.2 has the following properties:*

- *P is equivalent to itself*
- *If P is equivalent to Q then Q is equivalent to P*
- *If P is equivalent to Q and Q is equivalent to R, then P is equivalent to R*
- *If P is equivalent to Q and Q is an extremal then P is an extremal too*

We posed the question of characterizing all 3×3 extremal quasiconvex quadratic forms in [9] and provided a sufficient condition for elasticity tensors with orthotropic symmetry. Our choice was motivated by some examples that are listed below:

Example 1. The form $f(\xi) = \xi_{11}^2 + \xi_{22}^2 + \xi_{33}^2$ has a determinant of its y-matrix equal to $y_1^2 y_2^2 y_3^2$ which is an extremal polynomial, but $f(\xi)$ is obviously not an extremal.

Example 2. The form $f(\xi) = \xi_{11}^2 + \xi_{22}^2$ has a determinant of its y-matrix equal to 0, which is an extremal polynomial, but $f(\xi)$ is obviously not an extremal.

Example 3. The determinant of the y-matrix of any rank-one form is equivalently zero, but a rank-one form is not an extremal.

Example 4. The most interesting and motivating example is the form in (1.2) that appeared in [8]:

$$Q(\xi) = \xi_{11}^2 + \xi_{22}^2 + \xi_{33}^2 - 2(\xi_{11}\xi_{22} + \xi_{11}\xi_{33} + \xi_{22}\xi_{33}) + \xi_{12}^2 + \xi_{23}^2 + \xi_{31}^2.$$

It turns out that the polynomial

$$P(y) = y_1^4 y_2^2 + y_2^4 y_3^2 + y_3^4 y_1^2 - 3y_1^2 y_2^2 y_3^2$$

that is the determinant of the y-matrix of $Q(\xi)$, is an extremal polynomial that is not a perfect square, which is proven in [9]. The form $Q(\xi)$ has been proven to be an extremal in even a stronger sense than in Definition 1.1, e.g., [8, Theorem 1.5]. The following theorem is one of the main results of the paper.

Theorem 2.4. *Let $d \geq 3$ be a whole number and let the quadratic form $f(\xi) = \xi C \xi^T$ be quasiconvex, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{d\times d}$ and $C \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^4$ is a fourth order tensor. Assume furthermore that the determinant of the $y-$matrix of $f(x, y)$ is an irreducible extremal polynomial. Then f is an extremal form.*

It turns out, that the irreducibility of the determinant can be replaced by a weaker condition in the case $d = 3$, namely the following is true: *Any reducible extremal polynomial of degree 6 in 3 variables is a perfect square.* However, we will not prove that statement and will pursue a different way (that will also be useful for the subsequent observations) to prove the theorem in the case $d = 3$.

Theorem 2.5. *Let the quadratic form $f(\xi) = \xi C \xi^T$ be quasiconvex, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ and $C \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ is a fourth order tensor. Assume furthermore that the determinant of the $y-$matrix of $f(x, y)$ is an extremal polynomial that is not a perfect square. Then f is an extremal form.*

The next theorem gives a complete characterization for case (ii).

Theorem 2.6. *Let the quadratic form $f(\xi) = \xi C \xi^T$ be quasiconvex, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ and $C \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ is a fourth order tensor. Assume furthermore that the determinant of the $y-$matrix of $f(x, y)$ is identically zero. Then f is either an extremal or a polyconvex form.*

The next theorem gives a complete characterization for case (iii).

Theorem 2.7. *Let the quadratic form $f(\xi) = \xi C \xi^T$ be quasiconvex, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ and $C \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ is a fourth order tensor. Assume furthermore that the determinant of the $y-$matrix of $f(x,y)$ is a perfect square. Then f is either extremal, polyconvex or a sum of a rank-one and extremal forms, where the extremal has an identically zero determinant of the acoustic tensor.*

And finally, we conjecture, that case (iv) provides no extremals:

Conjecture 2.8. *Let the quadratic form $f(\xi) = \xi C \xi^T$ be quasiconvex, where $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{3\times 3}$ and $C \in (\mathbb{R}^3)^4$ is a fourth order tensor. Assume furthermore that the determinant of the $y-$matrix of $f(x,y)$ is not an extremal polynomial. Then f is not an extremal either.*

3 Auxiliary lemmas

In this section we prove some auxiliary lemmas to be utilized in the proof of the main results. Recall first a general fact from the theory of commutative algebras, e.g., [11, Theorem 6.14].

Theorem 3.1. *Every polynomial with real coefficients and in n variables can be uniquely written as a product of irreducible polynomials again with real coefficients.*

Next, let us mention, that in what follows $P(x) \vdots Q(x)$ or just $P \vdots Q$ means for polynomials $P(x)$ and $Q(x)$, that $Q(x)$ divides $P(x)$. Utilizing the above theorem, let us prove the following simple lemma.

Lemma 3.2. *Assume $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A(x) = (a_{ij}(x))$, $i = 1,\dots,m$, $j = 1,\dots,n$ is an $m \times n$ matrix with polynomial coefficients, such, that each term $a_{ij}(x)$ is a homogeneous polynomial of degree $2p$, where $m,n,d,p \in \mathbb{N}$. If $\operatorname{rank}(A(x)) \le 1$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then there exist homogeneous polynomials $b_i(x)$ and $c_i(x)$, such that $a_{ij}(x) = b_i(x)c_j(x)$, for $i = 1,\dots,m$, $j = 1,\dots,n$.*

Proof. We prove the statement by induction doing the induction for $m+n$. For $m+n=2$ there is nothing to prove. Assume the statement is true for $m+n = L$ and let us prove it for $m+n = L+1$. We can without loss of generality assume, that $n \ge 2$ as otherwise we can transpose the matrix $A(x)$. It is clear that the left $m \times (n-1)$ block of $A(x)$ has a rank at most 1, thus by induction $A(x)$ has the form

$$A(x) = \begin{bmatrix} b_1(x)c_1(x) & b_1(x)c_2(x) & \dots & b_1(x)c_{n-1}(x) & a_{1n}(x) \\ b_2(x)c_1(x) & b_2(x)c_2(x) & \dots & b_2(x)c_{n-1}(x) & a_{2n}(x) \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdots & \cdot & \cdot \\ b_m(x)c_1(x) & b_m(x)c_2(x) & \dots & b_m(x)c_{n-1}(x) & a_{mn}(x) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3.1}$$

First of all observe, that if $A(x)$ has a zero row or column, then by removing it we reduce the sum $m+n$ and thus finish the proof by induction by taking the factor $b_i(x)$ or $c_j(x)$ of that

row or column to be identically zero. Thus we assume, that all polynomials $c_j(x)$ are nonzero. Next, it is clear, that one can without loss of generality assume, that the greatest common factor of the polynomials $b_1(x), b_2(x), \ldots, b_m(x)$ is 1, as otherwise, it can be absorbed in each of $c_i(x)$, for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-1$. We have from the property $\operatorname{rank}(A(x)) \leq 1$, that

$$b_1(x)c_j(x)a_{in}(x) = b_i(x)c_j(x)a_{1n}(x), \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m,$$

thus as $c_j(x) \neq 0$, we obtain

$$b_1(x)a_{in}(x) = b_i(x)a_{1n}(x), \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \tag{3.2}$$

Assume $p(x)$ is any irreducible factor of $b_1(x)$ that appears with the power α in $b_1(x)$, i.e., $b_1(x) = p^\alpha(x)q(x)$. We then get from (3.2), that

$$p^\alpha(x)q(x)a_{in}(x) = b_i(x)a_{1n}(x), \quad \text{for all} \quad i = 1, 2, \ldots, m. \tag{3.3}$$

Since, $\operatorname{GCF}(b_1(x), b_2(x), \ldots, b_m(x)) = 1$, then there exists an index $i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, d\}$ such that $b_i(x)$ is not divisible by $p(x)$, thus we get from (3.3), that $a_{1n}(x) \vdots p^\alpha(x)$. As $p(x)$ was any factor, we get $a_{1n}(x) \vdots b_1(x)$, i.e,

$$a_{1n}(x) = b_1(x)c_n(x). \tag{3.4}$$

From the equality (3.2) we get either $b_1(x) \equiv 0$ or $a_{in}(x) = b_i(x)c_n(x)$, for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, m$. In the first case the matrix $A(x)$ has a row of zeros, thus by induction we are done, in the second case we get the desired representation of $A(x)$. □

Lemma 3.3. *Assume $A = A(x)$, where $x = (x_1, x_2, x_3)$ is a 3×3 symmetric matrix the entries of which are quadratic forms in x. Assume furthermore that*

$$\det(A(x)) \equiv 0 \quad \textit{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3,$$

and that the cofactor matrix A_{cof} of A has nonnegative elements on the diagonal. Then A_{cof} has one of the forms shown below:

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \alpha P & \beta P \\ \alpha P & \alpha^2 P & \alpha\beta P \\ \beta P & \alpha\beta P & \beta^2 P \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P_1^2 & P_1Q_1 & P_1R_1 \\ P_1Q_1 & Q_1^2 & Q_1R_1 \\ P_1R_1 & Q_1R_1 & R_1^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} l_1^2 S & l_1l_2 S & l_1l_3 S \\ l_1l_2 S & l_2^2 S & l_2l_3 S \\ l_1l_3 S & l_2l_3 S & l_3^2 S \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. The identity

$$\det(A(x)) \equiv 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3$$

implies that

$$\operatorname{rank}(A_{cof}(x)) \leq 1 \quad \text{for all} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^3. \tag{3.6}$$

The proof is now based on the following fact:
Assume $P(x)$ $Q(x)$ and $R(x)$ are homogeneous polynomials of degree four such that $P(x), Q(x) \geq 0$ and $P(x)Q(x) = R^2(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then one of the three situations is true:

(i) $P(x) \equiv Q(x)$ *and* $R(x) = \pm P(x)$,

(i) $P(x) = P_1^2(x)$, $Q(x) = Q_1^2(x)$ *and* $R(x) = P_1(x)Q_1(x)$,

(i) $P(x) = S(x)l_1^2(x)$, $Q(x) = S(x)l_2^2(x)$ *and* $R(x) = l_1(x)l_2(x)S(x)$.

The above fact is a direct consequence of the unique representation of polynomials as a product of irreducible multipliers. To finish the proof, we consider all 3 principal 2×2 minors of the matrix $A(x)$, for each of which the product of the diagonal terms is the square of the off-diagonal term, thus the above fact can be utilized to obtain the structure of the matrix $A(x)$. □

The next lemma is a sign-changing property of indefinite quadratic forms.

Lemma 3.4. *Assume $f(\xi)$ is an indefinite quadratic form in n variables that vanishes at a point $(\xi_1^0, \xi_2^0, \ldots, \xi_n^0)$. Then given any open neighbourhood U of the point $\xi^0 = (\xi_1^0, \xi_2^0, \ldots, \xi_n^0)$, there exist two open subsets $U_1, U_2 \subset U$ of U, such that*

$$f(\xi) < 0, \quad \xi \in U_1 \quad \textit{and} \quad f(\xi) > 0, \quad \xi \in U_2.$$

Proof. We can without loss of generality assume, that $f(\xi)$ has canonical form and thus due to its indefiniteness, f has the form

$$f(\xi) = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \xi_i^2 - \sum_{i=m+1}^{m+k} \xi_i^2, \tag{3.7}$$

where $1 \leq m < m+k \leq n$. Assume ϵ and δ are small numbers. We perturb the points ξ_i^0 to $\xi_i^0 + \epsilon$, for $i = 0, 1, \ldots, m$ and to $\xi_i^0 + \delta$, for $i = m+1, \ldots, m+k$ and denote

$$\xi_{\epsilon,\delta} = (\xi_1^0 + \epsilon, \ldots, \xi_m^0 + \epsilon, \xi_{m+1}^0 + \delta, \ldots, \xi_{m+k}^0 + \delta, \xi_{m+k+1}^0 + \epsilon, \ldots, \xi_n^0 + \epsilon).$$

It is clear, that if ϵ and δ are small enough, them $\xi_{\epsilon,\delta} \in U$. We have at the new point

$$f(\xi_{\epsilon,\delta}) = 2\epsilon(\xi_1^0 + \cdots \xi_m^0) - 2\delta(\xi_{m+1}^0 + \cdots \xi_{m+k}^0) + m\epsilon^2 - k\delta^2.$$

Denote $S_1 = \xi_1^0 + \cdots \xi_m^0$ and $S_2 = \xi_{m+1}^0 + \cdots \xi_{m+k}^0$. If $S_1 \neq 0$, then we can choose $\delta = \epsilon^2$ and choosing the sign of ϵ we can make the values of f both, positive and negative in some open subsets of U. The case $S_2 \neq 0$ is analogous. If now $S_1 = S_2 = 0$, then we have $f(\xi_{\epsilon,\delta}) = m\epsilon^2 - k\delta^2$, which can again be made both positive and negative in open subsets of U for small ϵ and δ by choosing either $\delta = \epsilon^2$ or $\epsilon = \delta^2$. □

The last lemma will be crucial in the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Lemma 3.5. *Let $P(x)$ be a quadratic form and let $Q(x)$ be a fourth order nonnegative homogeneous polynomial in $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Assume $\delta > 0$ and that for any $t \in [0, \delta]$ there exists a quadratic form $R_t(x)$ such, that $P^2(x) - tQ(x) = R_t^2(x)$. Then $Q(x) = \alpha^2 P^2(x)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Proof. Consider two cases.
Case 1: The form $P(x)$ is indefinite. Fix any $t \in (0, \delta)$. It is clear, that if $P(x) = 0$, then the condition $tQ(x) + R_t^2(x) = 0$ and the nonnegativity of $Q(x)$ imply, that $R_t(x) = 0$, thus Marecellini's theorem (see Theorem 5.3, Section 5) implies, that $R_t(x) = \lambda P(x)$ for all $x \in \mathbb{R}^3$ and some $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, which then gives $Q(x) = \alpha^2 P^2(x)$.
Case 2: The form $P(x)$ is definite. In this case we can without loss of generality assume, that $P(x)$ is positive semi-definite and it has a canonical form. If $P(x) = x_1^2$, then the inequality $x_1^4 - \delta Q(x) \geq 0$ for all $x_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ implies $Q(x) = \alpha x_1^4$, thus we are done. If $P(x) = x_1^2 + x_2^2$, then first of all the inequality $(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^2 - \delta Q(x) \geq 0$ for all $x_1, x_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ implies, that $Q(x)$ depends only on x_1 and x_2, i.e., $Q(x) = ax_1^4 + 2bx_1^3x_2 + cx_1^2x_2^2 + 2dx_1x_2^3 + ex_2^4$. We then have

$$\begin{aligned} P^2(x) - tQ(x) &= (1-ta)x_1^4 - 2tbx_1^3x_2 + (2-tc)x_1^2x_2^2 - 2tdx_1x_2^3 + (1-te)x_2^4 \qquad (3.8)\\ &= R_t^2(x_1, x_2) \\ &= (\sqrt{1-ta}x_1^2 - \frac{tb}{\sqrt{1-ta}}x_1x_2 + \sqrt{1-te}x_2^2)^2, \end{aligned}$$

from which we get $d = \frac{b\sqrt{1-te}}{\sqrt{1-ta}}$. We aim to show that $b = d = 0$. If $b = 0$, then the equality $d = \frac{b\sqrt{1-te}}{\sqrt{1-ta}}$ implies $d = 0$. If $b \neq 0$, then we get $\frac{d}{b} = \frac{\sqrt{1-te}}{\sqrt{1-ta}}$, which means, that the ratio $\frac{\sqrt{1-te}}{\sqrt{1-ta}}$ is constant, which is possible only if $a = e$ and thus we get $b = d$ as well. Equating now the coefficients of $x_1^2x_2^2$ of both sides of (3.8), we get

$$(2-tc)(1-ta) = b^2t^2 + 2(1-ta)^2, \quad t \in (0, \delta),$$

thus we obtain

$$t(2a-c) + t^2(ac - 2a^2 - b^2) = 0, \quad t \in (0, \delta),$$

which then implies $c = 2a$ and $b = 0$. Thus we get in all cases, that $b = d = 0$, therefore (3.8) reduces to

$$P^2(x) - tQ(x) = (1-ta)x_1^4 + (2-tc)x_1^2x_2^2 + (1-te)x_2^4 = (\sqrt{1-ta}x_1^2 + \sqrt{1-te}x_2^2)^2, \quad (3.9)$$

which gives from the equality of the coefficients of $x_1^2x_2^2$,

$$4t(a+e-c) + t^2(c^2 - 4ae) = 0, \quad t \in (0, \delta),$$

and thus $c = a+e$ and $c^2 = 4ae$, which then gives $(a-e)^2 = 0$, thus $a = e$ and $c = 2a$, and we finally get $Q(x) = aP^2(x)$. In the last case when $P(x) = x_1^2+x_2^2+x_3^2$, we can substitute $x_3 = 0$ in the equality $P^2(x) - tQ(x) = R_t^2(x)$ to get $P^2(x_1, x_2, 0) - tQ(x_1, x_2, 0) = R_t^2(x_1, x_2, 0)$, from where we already know, that the (x_1, x_2) part of Q has the form $a(x_1^2 + x_2^2)^2$. Similarly, the (x_1, x_3) and (x_2, x_3) parts of Q have the forms $a(x_1^2 + x_3^2)^2$ and $a(x_2^2 + x_3^2)^2$, which then implies, that Q has the desired form $aP^2(x)$. The proof is finished now. □

4 Extremal quadratic forms of arbitrary dimension

In this section we prove the main result of the paper.

Proof of Theorem 2.4. Assume in contradiction that $f(x,y)$ is not an extremal, then there exists a nonzero rank-one form $(xBy^T)^2$ such that

$$f(x,y) - (xBy^T)^2 \geq 0 \qquad \text{for all} \qquad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

From the inequality

$$f(x,y) - (xBy^T)^2 \geq 0$$

we get that

$$f(x,y) - t(xBy^T)^2 \geq 0 \quad \text{for all} \quad t \in [0,1] \quad \text{and} \quad x,y \in \mathbb{R}^d. \tag{4.1}$$

Denote now by $T(y)$ the $y-$matrix of the biquadratic form $f(x,y)$ and by $T_t(y)$ the $y-$matrix of the biquadratic form $f(x,y) - t(xBy^T)^2$. Inequality (4.1) now implies that the $y-$matrix of the form $f(x,y) - t(xBy^T)^2$, i.e., the matrix $T_t(y)$ is positive semi-definite for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $t \in [0,1]$. We recall the Brunn-Minkowski inequality for determinants [3,4], which we apply in the next step.

Theorem 4.1 (Brunn-Minkowski inequality)**.** *Assume $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and A and B are $n \times n$ symmetric positive semi-definite matrices. Then the following inequality holds:*

$$(\det(A+B))^{1/n} \geq (\det(A))^{1/n} + (\det(B))^{1/n}.$$

The equality

$$T(y) = [T(y) - T_t(y)] + [T_t(y)],$$

the positive semi-definiteness of the matrices $T(y) - T_t(y)$ and $T_t(y)$, and the Brunn-Minkowski inequality give the following estimate:

$$(\det(T(y)))^{1/d} \geq (\det(T(y) - T_t(y)))^{1/d} + (\det(T_t(y)))^{1/d},$$

or

$$\det(T(y)) \geq \det(T_t(y)). \tag{4.2}$$

By direct calculation we obtain

$$\det(T_t(y)) = \det(T(y)) - t \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij}, \tag{4.3}$$

where $s_i = \sum_{j=1}^{d} b_{ij} y_j$. Inequality (4.2) together with the relation (4.3) imply

$$\det(T(y)) \geq \det(T(y)) - t \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} \geq 0, \qquad t \in [0,1].$$

As by the requirement of the theorem $\det(T(y))$ is not identically zero and for $t = 0$ the right hand side of the last inequality is exactly $\det(T(y))$, then by the extremality of $\det(T(y))$ the right hand side must be a multiple of $\det(T(y))$, i.e.,

$$\det(T(y)) - t \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} = \lambda(t) \det(T(y)),$$

which gives

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} = \frac{1-\lambda(t)}{t} \det(T(y)), \qquad \text{for} \qquad t \in (0,1]. \tag{4.4}$$

Both parts of the equality (4.4) are polynomials in $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_d)$ thus the expression $\frac{1-\lambda(t)}{t}$ must be constant, therefore (4.4) reduces to

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} = \alpha \cdot \det(T(y)), \tag{4.5}$$

for some constant $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. The positive semi-definiteness of $T(y)$ implies positive semi-definiteness of the cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$, thus

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} \geq 0 \qquad \text{for all} \qquad y \in \mathbb{R}^d.$$

We have on the other hand $\det(T(y)) \geq 0$, and $\det(T(y))$ is not identically zero, thus $\alpha \geq 0$. Consider now two different cases:

Case 1: $\alpha = 0$. In this case identity (4.5) becomes

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} \equiv 0.$$

Recalling the positive semi-definiteness of $T_{cof}(y)$ we get the system of equalities:

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d} s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij} \equiv 0, \qquad i = 1, 2, \ldots, d. \tag{4.6}$$

Consider now the linear system

$$s_j = 0, \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, d.$$

As the matrix B has a rank at least 1, the solution to the above linear system is a proper subspace V of $\mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., is a set with measure zero in $\mathbb{R}^d$. Therefore the columns of the cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ are linearly dependent a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^d$ i.e., $\det(T_{cof}(y)) = 0$ a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and thus by continuity we get

$$\det(T_{cof}(y)) \equiv 0.$$

Taking the determinant of the identity $T(y)T_{cof}(y)^T = \det(T(y))I$ we get $\det(T(y)) \equiv 0$, which is a contradiction. **Case 1** is now proved.

Case 2: $\alpha > 0$. In this case identity (4.5) implies

$$\det(T(y)) = k \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij}, \qquad k > 0. \tag{4.7}$$

Our goal is now to prove that (4.7) implies that $\det(T(y))$ is a reducible polynomial. Consider the biquadratic form $g(x,y) = f(x,y) - k(xBy^T)^2$. Denote by $G(y)$ the y-matrix of g. By formula (4.3) we have

$$\det(G(y)) = \det(T(y)) - k\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (T_{cof}(y))_{ij},$$

thus owing to (4.7) we get

$$\det(G(y)) \equiv 0. \tag{4.8}$$

Utilizing again formula (4.3) we obtain from the identity $f(x,y) = g(x,y) + k(xBy^T)^2$,

$$\det(T(y)) = \det(G(y)) + k\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (G_{cof}(y))_{ij},$$

thus taking into account (4.8) we get

$$\det(T(y)) = k\sum_{i,j=1}^{d} s_i s_j (G_{cof}(y))_{ij}. \tag{4.9}$$

Next we apply Lemma 3.2 to the matrix G. The condition $\det(G(y)) \equiv 0$ in (4.8) implies, that

$$\operatorname{rank}(G_{cof}(y)) \leq 1, \quad \text{for all} \quad y \in \mathbb{R}^d, \tag{4.10}$$

thus we get from Lemma 3.2, that $(G_{cof}(y))_{ij} = a_i(y)b_j(y)$ for some polynomials $a_i(y)$ and $b_j(y)$, $i,j = 1,2,\ldots,d$. We then obtain from (4.9), that

$$\det(T(y)) = k\left(\sum_{i=1}^{d} a_i(y)s_i(y)\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{d} b_j(y)s_j(y)\right), \tag{4.11}$$

which contradicts the irreducibility of the polynomial $\det(T(y))$. The theorem is proven now. □

5 Quadratic forms with dimension $d = 3$.

In this section we prove Theorems 2.5-2.7.

Proof of Theorem 2.5. We aim to apply Lemma 3.3 to the matrix $G_{cof}(y)$, for which we must verify that the diagonal terms of the cofactor matrix $G_{cof}(y)$ are nonnegative. To prove that $(G_{cof}(y))_{33} \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, we can without loss of generality assume that $(G_{cof}(y))_{33} \neq 0$ for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, which means that the first two rows of $G(y)$ are linearly independent for a.e. $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$. As $\det(G(y)) \equiv 0$, then the last row of $G(y)$ is a linear combination of the first two, i.e., the matrix $G(y)$ has the form:

$$G(y) = \begin{bmatrix} g_{11} & g_{12} & ag_{11} + bg_{12} \\ g_{12} & g_{22} & ag_{12} + bg_{22} \\ ag_{11} + bg_{12} & ag_{12} + bg_{22} & a^2 g_{11} + b^2 g_{22} + 2abg_{12} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.1}$$

where

$$a(y) = -\frac{(G_{cof}(y))_{13}}{(G_{cof}(y))_{33}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad b(y) = -\frac{(G_{cof}(y))_{23}}{(G_{cof}(y))_{33}} \tag{5.2}$$

are rational functions defined a.e. in $\mathbb{R}^3$. From (5.1) and (5.2) we get

$$G_{cof}(y) = \begin{bmatrix} a^2(G_{cof})_{33} & ab(G_{cof})_{33} & -a(G_{cof})_{33} \\ ab(G_{cof})_{33} & b^2(G_{cof})_{33} & -b(G_{cof})_{33} \\ -a(G_{cof})_{33} & -b(G_{cof})_{33} & (G_{cof})_{33} \end{bmatrix}. \tag{5.3}$$

Plugging in the values of the entries of the cofactor matrix $G_{cof}(y)$ from formula (5.3) into (4.9) and utilizing (5.2) we arrive at

$$\det(T(y)) = k\frac{(s_1(G_{cof}(y))_{13} - s_2(G_{cof}(y))_{23} - s_3(G_{cof}(y))_{33})^2}{(G_{cof})_{33}}. \tag{5.4}$$

Therefore from the inequality $\det(T(y)) \geq 0$ and the fact that $\det(T(y))$ is not identically zero we get the desired inequality $(G_{cof}(y))_{33} \geq 0$. The nonnegativity of the other diagonal terms of the cofactor matrix is analogous. The requirements of Lemma 3.3 are now satisfied, thus the matrix $G_{cof}(y)$ has one of the forms shown in (3.5). For the first form in (3.5) we get by (4.9)

$$\det(T(y)) = k(G_{cof}(y))_{11}(s_1 + \alpha s_2 + \beta s_3)^2.$$

The multiplier $(G_{cof}(y))_{11}$ is a homogeneous nonnegative polynomial of degree four in three variables, thus by Hilbert's theorem [10,23] it can be expressed as a sum of perfect squares, which implies that $\det(T(y))$ is either a perfect square or not an extremal. For the second form in (3.5) we have

$$\det(T(y)) = k(s_1P_1 + s_2Q_1 + s_2Q_3)^2,$$

thus $\det(T(y))$ is a perfect square. For the third form in (3.5) we get

$$\det(T(y)) = kS(s_1l_1 + s_2l_2 + s_3l_3)^2.$$

By the same argument as for the first case we get that $S(y) \geq 0$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, thus being a convex quadratic form it can be written as the sum of squares of linear forms, which yields that $\det(T(y))$ is either a perfect square or not an extremal polynomial. The proof is finished. □

Proof of Theorem 2.6. Before starting the proof, let us recall the following classical result of Terprstra, which will be utilized in the sequel.

Theorem 5.1 (Terpstra)**.** *Any $2 \times n$ quasiconvex quadratic form is necessarily polyconvex, where $n \in \mathbb{N}$.*

Let us emphasize that a quadratic form is polyconvex if and only if it is a sum of a convex form and a Null-Lagramgian (which is a linear combination of all 2×2 minors of the matrix ξ), e.g., [7]. Thus, a quadratic form is polyconvex, if and only if, the biquadratic form obtained from it by substituting a rank-one matrix $x \otimes y$ in place of ξ is a sum of squares of linear combinations of x_iy_j. Hence, the lemma below is a corollary of Terprstra's result and the above observation, which will be a key factor in the proof of Theorem 2.6.

Lemma 5.2. *Assume $A(y)$ $B(y)$ and $C(y)$ are quadratic forms in n variables, such that $A(y)$ and $C(y)$ are positive semidefinite and $A(y)C(y) \geq B^2(y)$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$. Then the $2 \times n$ form $f(x,y) = x_1^2 A(y) + 2x_1x_2B(y) + x_2^2C(y)$ is convex in the variables $\xi_{ij} = x_iy_j$.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.1, it is sufficient to check, that the form $f(x,y)$ is quasiconvex, which is trivial, as its $y-$matrix has nonnegative diagonal terms $A(y)$ and $C(y)$ and a nonnegative determinant $A(y)C(y) - B^2(y) \geq 0$. □

Consider now 2 main cases.

Case 1: The cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ has a zero diagonal element.
First of all observe, that if one of the diagonal elements of $T(y)$ is identically zero, then $f(x,y)$ automatically becomes a 2×3 form and thus by Terprstra's result above, its quasiconvexity implies that it is polyconvex. Assume now $T(y)$ has second degree polynomial elements on the main diagonal and that $(T_{cof})_{33}(y) \equiv 0$. By the positive semi-definiteness of $T_{cof}(y)$, we then have that $(T_{cof})_{13}(y) = (T_{cof})_{23}(y) \equiv 0$. The last equalities imply, that the matrix obtained from $T(y)$ by removing the last row, has a rank at most one, thus by Lemma 3.2 the matrix $T(y)$ has either of the forms:

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \alpha P & \beta P \\ \alpha P & \alpha^2 P & \alpha\beta P \\ \beta P & \alpha\beta P & Q \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P_1^2 & P_1Q_1 & P_1R_1 \\ P_1Q_1 & Q_1^2 & Q_1R_1 \\ P_1R_1 & Q_1R_1 & S \end{bmatrix} \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{5.5}$$

where $\deg(P) = \deg(Q) = \deg(S) = 2$ and $\deg(P_1) = \deg(Q_1) = \deg(R_1) = 1$ and $\alpha \neq 0$. In the first case we have, that $P(y)$ is a positive semi-definite quadratic form and

$$0 \leq (T_{cof})_{11}(y) = \alpha^2 P(y)(Q(y) - \beta^2 P(y)),$$

thus

$$Q(y) - \beta^2 P(y) \geq 0,$$

which implies, that the form $Q(y) - \beta^2 P(y)$ is convex, i.e., it is a sum of squares, therefore

$$Q(y) = \beta^2 P(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2(y).$$

We then obtain, that

$$f(x,y) = P(y)(x_1 + \alpha x_2 + \beta x_3)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2(y)x_3^2,$$

and $P(y)$ is a convex quadratic form, therefore $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex. In the second case we get similarly, that

$$S(y) = R_1^2(y) + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2(y),$$

therefore

$$f(x,y) = (P_1(y)x_1 + Q_1(y)x_2 + R_1(y)x_3)^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2(y)x_3^2,$$

and thus is polyconvex.

Case 2: All diagonal elements of the cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ are nonzero.

In that case we have denoting $T(y) = (t_{ij}(y))_{i,j=1}^3$ that, since $\det T(y) \equiv 0$, then the last row of $T(y)$ is a linear combination of the first two, which means that $T(y)$ has the form of $G(y)$ shown in (5.1), hence we get

$$T(y) = \begin{bmatrix} t_{11} & t_{12} & at_{11} + bt_{12} \\ t_{12} & t_{22} & at_{12} + bt_{22} \\ at_{11} + bt_{12} & at_{12} + bt_{22} & a^2t_{11} + b^2t_{22} + 2abt_{12} \end{bmatrix}, \tag{5.6}$$

where

$$a(y) = -\frac{(T_{cof}(y))_{13}}{(T_{cof}(y))_{33}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad b(y) = -\frac{(T_{cof}(y))_{23}}{(T_{cof}(y))_{33}}. \tag{5.7}$$

On the other hand the matrix $T(y)$ satisfies the requirements of Lemma 3.3, thus the cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ has one of the forms

$$\begin{bmatrix} P & \alpha P & \beta P \\ \alpha P & \alpha^2 P & \alpha\beta P \\ \beta P & \alpha\beta P & \beta^2 P \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} P_1^2 & P_1Q_1 & P_1R_1 \\ P_1Q_1 & Q_1^2 & Q_1R_1 \\ P_1R_1 & Q_1R_1 & R_1^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \begin{bmatrix} l_1^2S & l_1l_2S & l_1l_3S \\ l_1l_2S & l_2^2S & l_2l_3S \\ l_1l_3S & l_2l_3S & l_3^2S \end{bmatrix}, \quad \alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{5.8}$$

Consider now each case separately.

Case 2a: The cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ has the first form shown in (5.8).

In the first case we have $a(y) = -\frac{1}{\beta} = a \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b(y) = -\frac{\alpha}{\beta} = b \in \mathbb{R}$, thus we get

$$f(x,y) = t_{11}(y)(x_1 + ax_3)^2 + 2t_{12}(y)(x_1 + ax_3)(x_2 + bx_3) + t_{22}(y)(x_2 + bx_3)^2. \tag{5.9}$$

It is clear, that $t_{11}, t_{22} \geq 0$ and $t_{11}t_{22} \geq t_{12}^2$ which is a consequence of the quasiconvexity of the form $f(x,y)$ for $x_3 = 0$, thus denoting $X_1 = x_1 + ax_3$ and $X_2 = x_2 + bx_3$, we get by Lemma 5.2, that the form

$$f(x,y) = t_{11}(y)X_1^2 + 2t_{12}(y)X_1X_2 + t_{22}(y)X_2^2$$

is convex in the variables X_iy_j, and thus the form $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex in the variables $\xi_{ij} = x_iy_j$, which completes the proof for the first case.

Case 2b: The cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ has the third form shown in (5.8).

In this case we have

$$f(x,y) = \frac{1}{l_3^2}\left[t_{11}(x_1l_3 - x_3l_1)^2 + 2t_{12}(x_1l_3 - x_3l_1)(x_2l_3 - x_3l_2) + t_{22}(x_2l_3 - x_3l_2)^2\right], \tag{5.10}$$

where $l_1, l_2, l_3 \neq 0$. Let us write the conditions that ensure, that $f(x,y)$ is a polynomial in x and y. We have, that the coefficients of x_1x_3 and x_2x_3 and are quadratic forms in y, which yields the following conditions:

$$(t_{11}l_1 + t_{12}l_2) \vdots l_3, \qquad (t_{12}l_1 + t_{22}l_2) \vdots l_3. \tag{5.11}$$

If now the linear forms l_1 and l_2 are divisible by l_3, i.e., $l_1, l_2 \vdots l_3$, then we have $l_1 = \alpha l_3$ and $l_2 = \beta l_3$, thus the cofactor matrix will have the first form shown in (5.8), which yields the

polyconvexity of f. If l_1 is divisible by l_3 and l_2 is not, then we get from (5.11), that $t_{12} \vdots l_3$ and $t_{22} \vdots l_3$, thus from the positive semi-definiteness of t_{22} we get

$$t_{22} = \alpha^2 l_3^2, \qquad t_{12} = l l_3, \tag{5.12}$$

where $l = l(y)$ is a linear form in l_3. It is clear, that $\alpha > 0$, thus we obtain from the condition $t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 \geq 0$, that

$$t_{11} \geq \frac{l^2}{\alpha^2}. \tag{5.13}$$

The condition (5.13) implies the the quadratic form $t_{11} - \frac{l^2}{\alpha^2}$ is convex, thus it can be written as a sum of squares, i.e.,

$$t_{11} = \frac{l^2}{\alpha^2} + \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2. \tag{5.14}$$

Putting now $l_1 = a l_3$ we get from (5.10),

$$f(x,y) = \left[\frac{l(x_1 - a x_3)}{\alpha} + \alpha(l_3 x_2 - l_2 x_3)\right]^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{3}[a_i(x_1 - a x_3)]^2, \tag{5.15}$$

which implies the polyconvexity of f. The last and the most tricky subcase here is when both l_1 and l_2 are not divisible by l_3. Assume, that the form f is not an extremal. We aim then to prove that it must be polyconvex. Assume the form $G(x,y) = f(x,y) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} x_i s_i(y)\right)^2$ is quasiconvex. Then from the proof of Thereom 2.5 we have, that $\det(T(y)) = S(l_1 s_1 + l_2 s_2 + l_3 s_3)^2$, where $T(y)$ is the acoustic matrix of $f(x,y)$. Therefore, we obtain the condition

$$l_1 s_1 + l_2 s_2 + l_3 s_3 \equiv 0. \tag{5.16}$$

We again recall Treprstra's result (Lemma 5.2) for the quadratic forms $A(y) = t_{11}(y)$, C(y)=$t_{22}(y)$ and $B(y) = t_{12}(y)$, which gives that the form $t_{11}(y)z_1^2 - 2t_{12}(y)z_1 z_2 + t_{22}(y)z_2^2$ must be convex in the variables $\xi_{ij} = z_i y_j$, thus it is a sum of squares, i.e.,

$$t_{11}(y)z_1^2 - 2t_{12}(y)z_1 z_2 + t_{22}(y)z_2^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{3}(a_i(y)z_1 - b_i(y)z_2)^2,$$

where $a_i(y)$ and $b_i(y)$ are linear forms in y. Therefore, the last equality implies

$$t_{11}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i^2(y), \quad t_{22}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} b_i^2(y), \quad t_{12}(y) = \sum_{i=1}^{3} a_i(y)b_i(y). \tag{5.17}$$

Next we obtain some divisibility conditions. First we have, that since the form $G(x,y) = f(x,y) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} x_i s_i(y)\right)^2$ is quasiconvex thus its 33 cofactor element must be nonnegative, i.e.,

$$(t_{11} - s_1^2)(t_{22} - s_2^2) - (t_{12} - s_1 s_2)^2 \geq 0,$$

which gives

$$t_{11}s_2^2 + t_{22}s_1^2 - 2t_{12}s_1 s_2 \leq t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2,$$

which can be rewritten as follows:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{3}(a_i s_2 - b_i s_1)^2 \le l_3^2 S. \tag{5.18}$$

The last inequality implies, that if $l_3 = 0$, then $a_i s_2 - b_i s_1 = 0$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, thus since l_3 is a linear form, we discover

$$(a_i s_2 - b_i s_1) \vdots\, l_3, \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \tag{5.19}$$

Next, we have from (5.10) and from (5.17) the following representation of $f(x, y)$:

$$f(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{3}\left[a_i x_1 + b_i x_2 - \frac{1}{l_3}(a_i l_1 + b_i l_2)x_3\right]^2, \tag{5.20}$$

where we aim to show, that $(a_i l_1 + b_i l_2) \vdots\, l_3$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, which will evidently ensure the polyconvexity of f. From (5.19) we have $(l_2 a_i s_2 - l_2 b_i s_1) \vdots\, l_3$ and from (5.16) we have $(l_2 s_2 + l_1 s_1) \vdots\, l_3$, thus we get from the last two divisibility conditions, that $s_1(a_i l_1 + b_i l_2) \vdots\, l_3$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$, hence, if s_1 is not divisible by l_3, then we are done. If now $s_1 \vdots\, l_3$, then we get from (5.16), that $s_2 \vdots\, l_3$ too. Similarly, as none of the forms l_1 and l_2 is zero, we get the following set of divisibility conditions:

$$s_i \vdots\, l_j, \quad \text{if} \quad i \neq j, \tag{5.21}$$

Note, that in the case when two of l_i and l_j are linearly dependent, we are done as shown in (5.11)-(5.15). The last observation then contradicts the conditions (5.21) unless $s_1 = s_2 = s_3 \equiv 0$, which itself is a contradiction as we are assuming the subtracted form $\left(\sum_{i=1}^{3} x_i s_i(y)\right)^2$ is not zero. The proof of **Case 2b** is finished now.

Case 2c: The cofactor matrix $T_{cof}(y)$ has the second form shown in (5.8). We again prove, that if $f(\xi)$ is not an extremal, then it must be polyconvex. Assume $f(\xi)$ is not an extremal, thus the biquadratic form $g(x, y) = f(x, y) - (x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2$ is nonnegative, where at least one of the linear forms $s_1(y), s_1(y)$ and $s_3(y)$ is nonzero. Invoking the idea in the proof of Theorem 2.4, we consider the bilinear form

$$f_h(x, y) = f(x, y) - h(x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2,$$

for all $h \in [0, 1]$. It is then clear, that $f_h(\xi)$ is quasiconvex for all $h \in [0, 1]$. On the other hand we have from (4.2), that

$$0 = \det(T(y)) \ge \det(T_h(y)) \ge 0,$$

thus we get

$$\det(T_h(y)) = 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad h \in [0, 1], \tag{5.22}$$

therefore the cofactor matrix $\operatorname{cof}(T_h(y))$ must have one of the forms shown in (5.8) for all $h \in [0, 1]$. If for a value $h_0 \in (0, 1)$ the matrix $\operatorname{cof}(T_{h_0}(y))$ has the first form shown

in (5.8), then by **Case 2a** the form $f_{h_0}(x,y)$ is polyconvex and so is the form $f(x,y) = f_{h_0}(x,y) + h_0(x_1s_1(y) + x_2s_2(y) + x_3s_3(y))^2$. If for a value $h_0 \in (0,1)$ the matrix $\mathrm{cof}(T_{h_0}(y))$ has the third form shown in (5.8), then by **Case 2b** the form $f_{h_0}(x,y)$ is polyconvex as it is not an extremal, and so is the form $f(x,y) = f_{h_0}(x,y) + h_0(x_1s_1(y) + x_2s_2(y) + x_3s_3(y))^2$. We assume then, that the matrix $\mathrm{cof}(T_h(y))$ has the second form shown in (5.8) for all $h \in [0,1]$, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{cof}(T_h(y)) = \begin{bmatrix} P_h^2 & P_hQ_h & P_hR_h \\ P_hQ_h & Q_h^2 & Q_hR_h \\ P_hR_h & Q_hR_h & R_h^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{for all} \quad h \in [0,1), \tag{5.23}$$

where we have moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} P_h^2 &= P^2 - h(s_2^2t_{33} + s_3^2t_{22} - 2s_2s_3t_{23}), \\ Q_h^2 &= Q^2 - h(s_1^2t_{33} + s_3^2t_{11} - 2s_1s_3t_{13}), \\ R_h^2 &= R^2 - h(s_1^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{11} - 2s_1s_2t_{12}). \end{aligned} \tag{5.24}$$

Applying now Lemma 3.5 to each of the identities in (5.24), we get, that

$$\begin{aligned} s_3^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{33} - 2s_2s_3t_{23} &= \alpha^2P^2 = \alpha^2(t_{22}t_{33} - t_{23}^2), \\ s_1^2t_{33} + s_3^2t_{11} - 2s_1s_3t_{13} &= \beta^2Q^2 = \beta^2(t_{11}t_{33} - t_{13}^2), \\ s_1^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{11} - 2s_1s_2t_{12} &= \gamma^2R^2 = \gamma^2(t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2). \end{aligned} \tag{5.25}$$

Next, we consider the following subcases:
Case 2ca: $\gamma = 0$ **and** $s_1 \neq 0$. In this case we have, that if $s_2 \equiv 0$, then $s_1^2t_{22} \equiv 0$, thus $t_{22} \equiv 0$, thus by the positivity $(T_{cof})_{33}(y) = t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 = -t_{12}^2 \geq 0$, we obtain $(T_{cof})_{33}(y) \equiv 0$, which puts us in **Case 1,** thus $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex. If now $s_2 \neq 0$, then we get from the last equality in (5.25), that

$$s_1^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{11} - 2s_1s_2t_{12} \equiv 0,$$

which gives $2s_1s_2t_{12} = s_1^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{11}$. By the geometric and arithmetic mean inequality we have

$$4s_1^2s_2^2t_{12}^2 = (s_1^2t_{22} + s_2^2t_{11})^2 \geq 4s_1^2s_2^2t_{11}t_{22},$$

from where we obtain $t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 \leq 0$, and thus by positivity $(T_{cof})_{33}(y) = t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 \equiv 0$, which again brings us beck to the situation in **Case 1,** and hence $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex. Next, observe, that since the form $x_1s_1(y) + x_2s_2(y) + x_3s_3(y)$ is not identically zero, then we can assume, that $s_1 \neq 0$, therefore the cases $\gamma = 0$ or $\beta = 0$ are done. We can then assume, that $\beta, \gamma \neq 0$. The next case is the following:
Case 2cb: $\alpha = 0$. We have already understood, that if in this case $s_2 \neq 0$ or $s_3 \neq 0$, then we are done. Assume now, that $s_2 = s_3 \equiv 0$. The formula (4.3) and the identity (5.22) imply

$$\sum_{i,j=1}^{3} s_i(y)s_j(y)(T_{cof})_{ij}(y) = \det(T_1(y)) = 0, \tag{5.26}$$

which gives $s_1^2(y)(T_{cof})_{11}(y) \equiv 0$, hence $(T_{cof})_{11}(y) \equiv 0$, which is again **Case 1,** and hence $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex. We can now assume, that we are in the following situation:
Case 2cc: $\alpha\beta\gamma \neq 0$ **and** $s_1 \neq 0$. If $s_2 = s_3 \equiv 0$, then we get from (5.26) and the following

observation, that $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex. Assume, now $s_2 \neq 0$. A straightforward manipulation transfers the equalities in (5.25) to the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\left(t_{11} - \frac{s_1^2}{\gamma^2}\right)\left(t_{22} - \frac{s_2^2}{\gamma^2}\right) &= \left(t_{12} - \frac{s_1 s_2}{\gamma^2}\right)^2, \\
\left(t_{11} - \frac{s_1^2}{\beta^2}\right)\left(t_{33} - \frac{s_3^2}{\beta^2}\right) &= \left(t_{13} - \frac{s_1 s_3}{\beta^2}\right)^2, \\
\left(t_{22} - \frac{s_2^2}{\alpha^2}\right)\left(t_{33} - \frac{s_2^2}{\alpha^2}\right) &= \left(t_{23} - \frac{s_2 s_3}{\alpha^2}\right)^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.27}$$

Observe, that from the first equality of (5.27) one must have one of the cases:

$$t_{11} - \frac{s_1^2}{\gamma^2} = S, \qquad t_{22} - \frac{s_2^2}{\gamma^2} = \lambda^2 S, \quad t_{12} - \frac{s_1 s_2}{\gamma^2} = \lambda S,$$

where S is a quadratic form and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$, or

$$t_{11} - \frac{s_1^2}{\gamma^2} = \delta u^2, \quad t_{22} - \frac{s_2^2}{\gamma^2} = \delta v^2, \quad t_{12} - \frac{s_1 s_2}{\gamma^2} = \delta uv,$$

where $\delta^2 = 1$. In the first case we have by direct calculation, that

$$t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 = S\frac{(s_2 - \lambda s_1)^2}{\gamma^2} = R^2,$$

thus one must have $S = s^2$, for some linear form s. Therefore, we have in all cases,

$$t_{11} = \frac{s_1^2}{\gamma^2} + \delta u^2, \quad t_{22} = \frac{s_2^2}{\gamma^2} + \delta v^2, \quad t_{12} = \frac{s_1 s_2}{\gamma^2} + \delta uv,$$

where $\delta = \pm 1$. We have on the other hand, that

$$t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2 = \frac{\delta}{\gamma^2}(s_1 v - s_2 u)^2 \geq 0,$$

from where, and from the fact that the cofactor element $t_{11}t_{22} - t_{12}^2$ is not identically zero, we get $\delta = 1$. Concluding, we get the following representation of t_{11}, t_{22} and t_{12} :

$$t_{11} = \frac{s_1^2}{\gamma^2} + u^2, \quad t_{22} = \frac{s_2^2}{\gamma^2} + v^2, \quad t_{22} = \frac{s_1 s_2}{\gamma^2} + uv. \tag{5.28}$$

It is also clear, that all 6 multipliers on the left hand side of equation (5.27) satisfy similar identities. Denote $\lambda = \frac{1}{\max(\alpha,\beta,\gamma)}$ and consider the form

$$f_\lambda(x, y) = f(x, y) - \lambda(x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2.$$

We aim to prove, that the biquadratic form $f_\lambda(x, y)$ is nonnegative. To that end, note first of all, that the equation (5.26) and the formula (4.3) for the determinant of f_λ imply, that

$$\det(T_\lambda(y)) = 0. \tag{5.29}$$

Second, note, that (5.24) and (5.25) imply, that

$$P_h^2 = P^2(1-h\alpha) \geq 0, \quad Q_h^2 = Q^2(1-h\beta) \geq 0, \quad Q_h^2 = Q^2(1-h\gamma) \geq 0, \quad \text{for all} \quad h \in [0,1],$$

from where we get

$$0 < \alpha, \beta, \gamma \leq 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \geq 1. \tag{5.30}$$

Next, the diagonal elements of the matrix $T_\lambda(y)$ are $t_{11} - \lambda s_1^2$, $t_{22} - \lambda s_2^2$ and $t_{33} - \lambda s_3^2$, respectively, which are nonnegative due to the conditions (5.28), (5.30) and the definition of λ. Again, by (5.24) and (5.25), the principal minors of $T_\lambda(y)$ are $P^2(1-\lambda\alpha)$, $Q^2(1-\lambda\beta)$ and $= Q^2(1-\lambda\gamma)$, which are obviously nonnegative. Concluding, we obtain that the form f_λ is quasiconvex. Moreover one of the diagonal elements of the cofactor matrix $\mathrm{cof}(T_\lambda(y))$ is identically zero, which again goes back to the **Case 1** for f_λ implying, that f_λ is polyconvex and therefore so is the form $f(x,y) = f_\lambda(x,y) + \lambda(x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2$. The proof of the theorem is finished now.

□

Proof of Theorem 2.7. . To begin with, let us assume that $f(\xi)$ is not an extremal. Recall that then the analysis in the beginning of Section 4 goes through, thus we have the following identities

$$f(x,y) = g(x,y) + (x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 k s_3(y))^2, \tag{5.31}$$

and

$$\det(G(y)) \equiv 0, \tag{5.32}$$

where $G(y)$ is the $y-$matrix of the form $g(x,y)$ and $s_i(y)$, $i = 1,2,3$, are linear forms in y. We have seen furthermore in (5.1)-(5.5), that the diagonal terms of the cofactor matrix $G_{cof}(y)$ are nonnegative. Consider now three different cases:

Case 1. One of the diagonal elements of $G(y)$ is positive semi-definite.

In this case we have by the Sylvester's criterion, that the matrix $G(y)$ is positive semi-definite, thus the form $g(x,y)$ is quasiconvex with an identically zero determinant of its acoustic matrix, therefore Theorem 2.6 immediately implies, that the form $g(\xi)$ is a sum of a rank-one form and an extremal that has an identically zero determinant.

Case 2. One of the diagonal elements of $G(y)$ is indefinite.

We can without loss of generality assume, that the element $g_{11}(y)$ is indefinite. Let us show, that $g_{11}(y) = 0$ implies $g_{22}(y) = 0$ and $g_{33}(y) = 0$. Indeed, assume by contradiction, that $g_{22}(y^0) > 0$ and $g_{11}(y^0) = 0$, for some $y^0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$. Then by continuity, $g_{22}(y) > 0$ in a neighbourhood U of the point y^0 and by Lemma 3.4, we have $g_{11}(y^1) < 0$, for some point $y^1 \in U$, thus $g_{11}(y^1)g_{22}(y^1) < 0$, which contradicts the inequality $(G_{cof}(y^1))_{33} = g_{11}(y^1)g_{22}(y^1) - g_{12}^2(y^1) \geq 0$. The proof of the case $g_{11}(y^1) > 0$ is analogous, as Lemma 3.4 provides both positive and negative values of g_{11}. Next we apply the following result of Marcellini, [16, Corollary 1]: the original formulation is below.

Theorem 5.3 (Marcellini)**.** *Let f and g be two quadratic forms in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with g indefinite. If $f(\xi) = 0$ for every ξ such that $g(\xi) = 0$, then there exists $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $f = \lambda g$.*

Now, due to the above theorem and the nonnegativity of the diagonal elements of the cofactor matrix, we get that the exist constants $\lambda, \mu \geq 0$, such, that

$$g_{22}(y) = \lambda^2 g_{11}(y), \qquad g_{33}(y) = \mu^2 g_{11}(y). \tag{5.33}$$

Note, that the case $\lambda = 0$ or $\mu = 0$ reduces to the first case, thus we can assume, that $\lambda, \mu > 0$. The inequality

$$(G_{cof}(y))_{33} = g_{11}(y)g_{22}(y) - g_{12}^2(y) \geq 0,$$

implies, that if $g_{11}(y) = 0$ then $g_{12}(y) = 0$, thus we again get from the indefiniteness of $g_{11}(y)$, that $g_{12}(y) = \alpha g_{11}(y)$. Similarly, we get $g_{13}(y) = \beta g_{11}(y)$ and $g_{23}(y) = \gamma g_{11}(y)$, thus the matrix $G(y)$ has the form

$$G(y) = g_{11}(y) \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \alpha & \beta \\ \alpha & \lambda^2 & \gamma \\ \beta & \gamma & \mu^2 \end{bmatrix} = g_{11}(y) \cdot A. \tag{5.34}$$

Again, the condition

$$0 \leq (G_{cof}(y))_{33} = g_{11}(y)g_{22}(y) - g_{12}^2(y) = g_{11}^2(y)(\lambda^2 - \alpha^2),$$

and the indefiniteness of $g_{11}(y)$ imply

$$\lambda^2 \geq \alpha^2. \tag{5.35}$$

The condition

$$0 = \det(G(y)) = g_{11}^3(y)\det(A)$$

and the indefiniteness of $g_{11}(y)$ imply

$$\det(A) = 0. \tag{5.36}$$

Combining conditions (5.35) and (5.36), we get, that the matrix A is positive semi-definite by Sylvester's criterion, and we have the following representation of f,

$$f(x, y) = g_{11}(y)xAx^T + (x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2. \tag{5.37}$$

If one of the linear forms $s_i(y)$, say $s_2(y)$ is identically zero, then $f(x, y)$ will become negative for some y that makes $g_{11}(y)$ negative and for $x = (0, x_2, 0)$ with big enough values of x_2, thus the linear forms $s_i(y)$ are nonzero. We aim the to show, that the bilinear form $x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y)$ separates in the x and y variables, i.e., each $s_i(y)$ is a scalar multiple of $s_1(y)$. Indeed, first of all it is clear that the solution of the linear equation $s_1(y) = 0$ is a proper subspace of R^3, thus has a zero measure. Therefore, by Lemma 3.4, we can choose y^0 such that $g_{11}(y^0) < 0$ and $s_1(y^0) \neq 0$. By continuity, there exists $\epsilon > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} g_{11}(y^0) < 0 \quad &\text{if} \quad y \in B_\epsilon(y^0) \\ s_1(y^0) \neq 0 \quad &\text{if} \quad y \in B_\epsilon(y^0), \end{aligned} \tag{5.38}$$

where $B_\epsilon(y^0) \in \mathbb{R}^3$ is the ball centered at y^0 and with radius ϵ. Next, we choose

$$x_1 = -x_2 \frac{s_2(y)}{l_s(y)} - x_3 \frac{s_3(y)}{s_1(y)},$$

that makes the bilinear form $x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y)$ vanish. Due to the quasiconvexity of f, the condition $g_{11}(y) < 0$ and the positive semi-definiteness of the matrix A, we must have $xAx^T = 0$ as long as $x_1 = -x_2 \frac{s_2(y)}{s_1(y)} - x_3 \frac{s_3(y)}{s_1(y)}$. We aim now to prove, that the latter is possible only, if s_2 and s_3 are constant multiples of s_1. The solution of $xAx^T = 0$ is a proper subspace of $\mathbb{R}^3$, thus if we assume, that $\frac{s_2(y)}{s_1(y)}$ is not constant, then the solution of $\frac{s_2(y)}{s_1(y)} = c$ must be a proper subspace of R^3 for any $c \in \mathbb{R}$, thus if y runs over the ball $B_\epsilon(y^0)$, the ratio $\frac{s_2(y)}{s_1(y)}$ takes infinitely many values as the ball has a positive measure and therefore the solution x of $x_1 = -x_2 \frac{s_2(y)}{s_1(y)} - x_3 \frac{s_3(y)}{s_1(y)}$ when y runs over $B_\epsilon(y^0)$, can not be contained in a proper subspace of R^3. Therefore we have $s_2(y) = a s_1(y)$ and $s_3(y) = b s_1(y)$, and hence we arrive at the formula

$$f(x, y) = g_{11}(y) x A x^T + s_1^2(y)(x_1 + a x_2 + b x_3)^2. \tag{5.39}$$

It is now clear, that if $x_1 + a x_2 + b x_3 = 0$, then $xAx^T = 0$, thus since $x_1 + a x_2 + b x_3$ is linear, is must divide the quadratic form xAx^T, therefore from the positivity of xAx^T we get $xAx^T = c(x_1 + a x_2 + b x_3)^2$, which then yields

$$f(x, y) = (s_1^2(y) + c g_{11}(y))(x_1 + a x_2 + b x_3)^2. \tag{5.40}$$

Finally, the positivity of $f(x, y)$ implies the positivity of the quadratic form $s_1^2(y) + c g_{11}(y)$ and thus the polyconvexity of $f(\xi)$.

Case 3. All diagonal elements of $G(y)$ are negative semi-definite.
Denote $H(y) = -G(y)$, thus $H(y)$ is positive semi-definite and

$$f(x, y) = (x_1 s_1(y) + x_2 s_2(y) + x_3 s_3(y))^2 - x H(y) x^T. \tag{5.41}$$

Observe, that if $s_1(y) = 0$ for some $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$, then choosing $x = (x_1, 0, 0)$ we have

$$f(x, y) = -h_{11}(y) x_1^2 \geq 0,$$

thus $h_{11}(y) = 0$, which implies, that $h_{11}(y)$ is divisible by $s_1(y)$ and by the positivity of $h_{11}(y)$, we get $h_{11}(y) = a_{11} s_1^2(y)$. Similarly we have $h_{22}(y) = a_{22} s_2^2(y)$ and $h_{33}(y) = a_{33} s_3^2(y)$, where $a_{11}, a_{22}, a_{33} \geq 0$. Next, we have from the inequality $h_{ii}(y) h_{jj}(y) \leq h_{ij}^2(y)$ thus $h_{ij}(y) = a_{ij} s_i(y) s_j(y)$ and thus the form $xH(y)x^T$ depends only on the variables $z_1 = x_1 s_1(y), z_2 = x_2 s_2(y), z_3 = x_3 s_3(y)$, which gives

$$f(x, y) = z A z^T, \tag{5.42}$$

for some matrix A. If $s_1 \equiv 0$, then the form $xH(y)x^T$ does not depend on x_1 and thus we end up with a 2×3 quasiconvex form, therefore by Theorem 5.1 it will be polyconvex. If none of the linear forms $s_i(y)$ is identically zero, then we can choose $y \in \mathbb{R}^3$ such that $s_i(y) \neq 0$, and thus when the variable x runs over $\mathbb{R}^3$, then the variable z takes all values in $\mathbb{R}^3$, hence the inequality $f(x, y) = z A z^T \geq 0$ implies that A is positive semi-definite. Concluding, we obtain, that $f(\xi)$ is polyconvex then. The proof is finished now. □

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to Marin Petkovic for fruitful discussions and the National Science Foundation for support through grant DMS-1211359.

References

[1] G. Allaire and R.V. Kohn. Optimal lower bounds on the elastic energy of a composite made from two non-well-ordered isotropic materials, *Quarterly of applied mathematics,* vol. LII, 2 (1994), 331–333.

[2] J. M. Ball. Convexity conditions and existence theorems in nonlinear elasticity, *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal,* 63 (1977), 337–403.

[3] E. F. Beckenbach and R. Bellman, *Inequalities,* Springer, Berlin, 1961. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-64971-4

[4] R. Bellman, *Introduction to Matrix Analysis,* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1960.

[5] G. Blekherman, G. G. Smith and M. Velasco. Sums of squares and varieties of minimal degree, *Journal of the American Mathematical Society,* http://dx.doi.org/10.1090/jams/847, Article electronically published on September 3, 2015.

[6] H. B. Callen, *Thermodynamics: An Introduction to the Physical Theories of Equilibrium Thermostatics and Irreversible Thermodynamics*, Wiley, New York / London / Sydney, Australia, 1960.

[7] B. Dacorogna. *Direct methods in the calculus of variations* 2nd Edition, 2008 Springer Science+Business Media, LLC.

[8] D. Harutyunyan and G. W. Milton. Explicit examples of extremal quasiconvex quadratic forms that are not polyconvex, *Calculus of Variations and Partial Differential Equations.*, October 2015, Volume 54, Issue 2, pp. 1575–1589.

[9] D. Harutyunyan and G. W. Milton. On the relation between extremal elasticity tensors with orthotropic symmetry and extremal polynomials, *submitted.*

[10] D. Hilbert. Über die Darstellung definiter Formen als Summen von Formenquadraten. Math. Ann. 32 (1888), 342–350.

[11] T. W. Hungerford. *Algebra.* Springer-Verlag New York Inc. 1974.

[12] R. B. Israel. Convexity in the Theory of Lattice Gases, Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1979.

[13] H. Kang and G. W. Milton. Bounds on the volume fractions of two materials in a three dimensional body from boundary measurements by the translation method, *SIAM Journal on Applied Mathematics*, 73 (2013), 475-492.

[14] K. A. Lurie and A. V. Cherkaev. Accurate estimates of the conductivity of mixtures formed of two materials in a given proportion (two-dimensional problem), *Doklady Akademii Nauk SSSR,* 264 (1982), 1128–1130, English translation in *Soviet Phys. Dokl.* 27 (1982), 461–462.

[15] K. A. Lurie and A. V. Cherkaev. Exact estimates of conductivity of composites formed by two isotropically conducting media taken in prescribed proportion *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Section A, Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 99 (1984), 71–87.

[16] P. Marcellini. Quasiconvex quadratic forms in two dimensions, *Applied Mathematics and Optimization*, 11:183–189 (1984).

[17] G. W. Milton. On characterizing the set of positive effective tensors of composites: The variational method and the translation method, *Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics,* Vol. XLIII (1990) 63–125.

[18] G. W. Milton. *The Theory of Composites* vol. 6 of Cambridge Monographs on Applied and Computational Mathematics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 2002

[19] G.W. Milton. Sharp inequalities which generalize the divergence theorem–an extension of the notion of quasiconvexity , *Proceedings Royal Society A* 469 (2013), 20130075: see also the Addendum in arXiv:1302.0942v4 [math.AP].

[20] C. B. Morrey. Quasiconvexity and the lower semicontinuity of multiple integrals, *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* 2 (1952) 25–53

[21] C. B. Morrey. *Multiple integrals in the calculus of variations*, Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[22] F. Murat and L. Tartar. Calcul des variations et homogén ísation. (French) [Calculus of variation and homogenization], in Les méthodes de l'homog én éisation: théorie et applications en physique, volume 57 of Collection de la Direction des études et recherches d'Electricité de France, pages 319-369, Paris, 1985, Eyrolles, English translation in Topics in the Mathematical Modelling of Composite Materials, pp. 139-173, ed. by A. Cherkaev and R. Kohn, ISBN 0-8176-3662-5.

[23] V. V. Prasolov. *Polynomials: Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*, MCCME Moscow Center for Continuous Math. Education, 2nd Edition, 2001.

[24] L. Tartar, Estimation de coefficients homogénéisés (French) [Estimation of homogenization coefficients], in Computing Methods in Applied Sciences and Engineering: Third International Symposium, Versailles, France, December 5–9, 1977, pages 364–373, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1979, English translation in Topics in the Mathematical Modelling of Composite Materials, pp. 9-20, ed. by A. Cherkaev and R. Kohn, ISBN 0-8176-3662-5.

[25] L. Tartar, Estimations fines des coefficients homogén éis és. (French) [Fine estimations of homogenized coefficients], in Ennio de Giorgi Colloquium: Papers Presented at a Colloquium held at the H. Poincaré Institute in November 1983, edited by P. Krée, volume 125 of Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics, pages 168-187, London, 1985, Pitman Publishing Ltd.

[26] F. J. Terpstra. Die Darstellung biquadratischer Formen als Summen von Quadraten mit Anwendung auf die Variationsrechnung, *Mathematische Annalen* 116 (1938), 166-180.

[27] D. Serre. Condition de Legendre-Hadamard: Espaces de matrices de rang$\neq$ 1. (French) [Legendre-Hadamard condition: Space of matrices of rank$\neq$ 1], Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences, Paris 293 (1981), 23-26.

[28] D. Serre. Formes quadratiques et calcul des variations (French) [Quadratic forms and the calculus of variations], *Journal de Math ématiques Pures et Appliquées* 62 (1983), 177-196.

[29] L. Van Hove. Sur l'extension de la condition de Legendre du calcul des variations aux intégrales multiples á plusieurs functions inconnues, *Nederl. Akad. Wetensch. Proc.* 50 (1947), 18-23.

[30] L. Van Hove. Sur le signe de la variation seconde des intégrales multiples á plusieurs functions inconnues, *Acad. Roy. Belgique Cl. Sci. Mém. Coll.* 24 (1949), 68.